

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

24033

an outstanding and dedicated member of the Legislature of Illinois. Few men in the history of the Legislature of Illinois have served so long continuously, and in the passing of Hon. John G. Ryan the community in which he lived, Chicago and the State of Illinois have suffered a great loss.

To his devoted wife Agnes, his two fine sons, John G., Jr., and Robert L., his two noble daughters, Mrs. Mary O'Connor and Mrs. Patricia Leonard, and his 20 grandchildren I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my deep-felt sorrow in the loss of my very dear friend John G. Ryan, and extend my sympathy to the members of his family who are bereaved by the loss of this great man.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan was a member of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois for a period of 31 years, representing the 25th District for the past 8 years. He was one of the outstanding members of the State legislature and was one to champion progressive legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of knowing John Ryan for over 40 years and knew him intimately because a part of his legislative district was in the 17th ward of which I was the Democratic ward committeeman for 24 years. I felt that he was a sincere, dedicated man, and most capable in not only his public position but in his civic activities and in the community and city.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Illinois has lost a man of great stature, a man who brought dignity to the State legislature, and one who was known far and wide for his sympathy and understanding of the problems of his fellow man. I regret my words are inadequate to express the deep feeling I have at the loss of a dear and close friend.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] in expressing sorrow in the passing of my former colleague in the Illinois General Assembly, John G. Ryan.

It was my privilege to serve in the Illinois Legislature with the late Representative John Ryan for more than a decade and to observe his devotion to public service and his deep concern in the problems of our beloved State of Illinois.

Mr. Ryan won the respect and affection of his fellow legislators and contributed generously of his time, counsel and energy in the public service.

I join the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] and the many others in Illinois and in the Nation who mourn the passing of John Ryan.

I extend my sympathy to his widow and other members of the family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks following mine on the death of Hon. John G. Ryan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NEWSLETTER OF CONGRESSMAN ABERNETHY

(Mr. WINSTEAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include a newsletter by the gentleman from Mississippi, THOMAS G. ABERNETHY.)

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the newsletter of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY]:

IN THE NEWS

(By Congressman ABERNETHY)

Why did Lee Harvey Oswald take the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy?

As the years go by fiction writers will produce a variety of conflicting "authentic" stories. Columns and books will be filled with fanciful theories of why he committed the act. And in the absence of a confession and conviction, many will question that he did it at all. This tragedy will produce a Roman holiday for fiction writers, theorists, propagandists, and just plain cranks.

There cannot be the slightest glimmer of doubt that Oswald was the killer. His reason, no one knows. And we may never know. But reflected in the thoughts of "why" and "who" is one well accepted fact. That is, nothing is more repugnant to the American people than a cowardly assassination of their head of state.

Under our system every American has a perfect right to express his dislike, if he has such, for the President or any other public officials. But as someone, shortly after the murder, so well said, "We don't shoot 'em out; we vote 'em out." Every American may not always get who he wants, or what he wants. But one thing for sure, we do not tolerate or condone the firing of deadly weapons at those we dislike or with whom we disagree.

After the shooting a goodly number allowed their personal bias to associate the murder with a segment of our society which strongly opposed the policies of President Kennedy, particularly those who opposed his policy on civil rights. Even Chief Justice Warren, and a few others within Washington's officialdom, delved off into the realm of biased speculation. Statements promptly hit the wires about hatred, bigots, racial intolerance, and the like. Those who issued such statements spoke prematurely and quickly found themselves in a state of embarrassment when word poured back that the killer was a leftwing, militant, radical member of the Communist sect (the membership of which has been the beneficiary of numerous amazing decisions of Mr. Warren's Court).

We continue to read much about an alleged "growing wave of indifference, intolerance, bigotry, and race hatred." This should not go unchallenged. The spirit of hate does not prevail to any more extent today than it did in the days of the early settlers. If anything, there is less hate in our land now than then. It is nothing short of a heinous indictment of Americans to charge, or even suggest, that our President was mowed down because of a "growing spirit of hate and racial bigotry." Everyone from the FBI to the Dallas Police Department is convinced that Oswald, and he alone, planned the shooting. Why did he do it? No one knows. Malice (hate) precedes every murder. For some reason there was malice and hate in Oswald's heart. But the hate was his and his alone. There is not the slightest shred of evidence that it was associated with or sprang from an alleged wave of racial hatred or racial bigotry.

There has never been a time from George Washington to Lyndon Baines Johnson when it was safe for the President to freely mingle with the public. There has never been a time when the President was not under some

degree of guard. Without such the probabilities are that every one of them would, at the hands of some hothead, crank, disgruntled extremist or anarchist, have met the fate of Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, and Kennedy. Jackson, Roosevelt, and Truman barely escaped. Although we live in one of the most civilized nations of the world, we still have and will always have some who will take human life, even that of the President.

Now to other thoughts. We are very fortunate to live in a land where not even the most sudden and tragic passing of the head of our country stalls the wheels of orderly government. There was no grab for power, no revolting military, no unauthorized takeover, no coup, and no panicking. Calm prevailed throughout the land, particularly in the Capital City. Within minutes a new President was sworn in. The brilliant architects of our Government provided well for such a contingency as the Nation experienced on that fateful Friday, November 22, 1963.

Except only for a respectful pause and a time out for quiet meditation and prayer, the business of this great and powerful Government moved steadily on in the midst of heart-rending tragedy.

CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM ON OTEPKA CASE INDICATES SECRETARY RUSK IS BEHIND MOVE TO HAVE OTEPKA OUSTED AND THREATENS FURTHER PURGE

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the facts stated in a confidential memorandum respecting certain conferences on November 19, 1962, presided over by Under Secretary of State for Administration, Mr. William Crockett, and attended by division heads and branch chiefs of the Office of Security, which memorandum comes from an unimpeachable source, indicate conclusively that Oteпка is up before a kangaroo court, that the final outcome of the case is probably predetermined, and that a further investigation by Congress of the entire matter is fully justified.

I am placing a copy of this memorandum in the RECORD. The memorandum clearly reveals that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is not and cannot be in a quasi-judicial impartial position respecting the Oteпка case but made up his mind some time ago that Oteпка must be punished. The probability is that Secretary Rusk has previously called the signals covering past actions against Oteпка and is admittedly still the quarterback on Oteпка's review—so the same score after the replay will be no surprise.

The statement that the Secretary regretfully had to accept Reilly and Hill resignations means simply that they were let out not so much for what they did as for getting caught at it.

The statement by the State Department that the Reilly-Hill cases are unrelated to the Oteпка case will not stand up under scrutiny. Reilly first went personally to the Justice Department with the Oteпка case asking for an FBI investigation and seeking criminal action against Oteпка for alleged violation of espionage statutes. When thwarted in this move, he then gave the instruc-

tions which led to the bringing of formal charges against Otepka within the Department. Reilly is the Department's principal witness against Otepka and Hill is an indispensable witness against Otepka if he is to be further prosecuted.

Evidence already disclosed indicates strongly that Reilly and Hill lied under oath about these matters makes them unreliable witnesses and raises a serious question whether Otepka should be punished or disciplined in any way in reliance on their statements.

Investigation of staff members of a congressional committee by State Department personnel is not a proper function of the Department and destroys the legislative-executive constitutional separation of powers.

If congressional committee staff members receiving information for their committees are not authorized persons for that purpose, then it can be argued in the future, because it logically follows, that congressional committees likewise are not authorized to receive such information.

A copy of this confidential memorandum, dated November 21, 1963, which as I say comes from a high source and an unimpeachable source that has proven reliable in all other instances, is quoted hereafter:

NOVEMBER 21, 1963.

Crockett stated Secretary Rusk had "regretfully had to accept" the resignations of John F. Reilly and Elmer D. Hill. (Reilly was in charge of the Office of Security and Hill was chief of the Technical Services Division.)

Following the conference referred to above, Robert Berry, chief of the Division of Investigations, Office of Security (Headquarters), called a meeting of all the special agents of the Washington Field Office of that Division (located at 515 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C.). At this meeting Berry reported on the Crockett conference earlier in the day, covering the points referred to above. Berry also stated that disclosure to the press of the psychological tests given by the Office of Security was under investigation, but that he was not free to divulge the type of investigation involved. Berry added that only personnel of the Division of Investigations had access to these tests, and that accordingly such personnel provides all the suspects in the psychological tests "leak."

At this meeting George Spoth, special agent in charge, Washington Field Office, reminded Berry he had forgotten to report that Mr. Crockett had made a statement about channels being open to the Secretary, and that should anyone disagree with Department policy, if he so requested he would be granted an audience with the Secretary. Spoth pointed out Crockett had said: "We have lost face and it's up to us to regain it."

Mr. Berry was asked to comment about the report in the Allen-Scott newspaper column that two members of the Office of Security were investigating staff employees of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Berry said it was necessary to investigate the staff of the subcommittee because the Office of Security had information that classified information was furnished to such persons, who, Berry stressed, were unauthorized persons within the scope of the instructions respecting the safeguarding of classified information.

Also on November 19, 1963, Frederick Trauband, chief of the Personnel Security Branch, Division of Evaluations, Office of Security, who had attended the meeting in Crockett's office earlier that day, told members of his

staff they should not be concerned with the outcome of the Otepka case; that in due course Otepka definitely would be punished for furnishing information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Mr. William Crockett, on November 19, 1963, presided at a conference attended by division heads and branch chiefs of the Office of Security.

At this conference Crockett said he wanted the Office of Security to know that Secretary Rusk was very disturbed about the Otepka case and its related events, and that the Secretary further had stated he intended to insist upon loyalty to him.

Crockett reported the Secretary had indicated his opinion that the Department of State was wholly justified in its action against Otepka. Using a football simile, Crockett reported, the Secretary had said: "These men went out of bounds. When that happens, you cure the situation."

Crockett reported the Secretary had stated Otepka's case was to be vigorously pursued, and had declared that the Reilly and Hill cases were unrelated to the Otepka case, which would be dealt with on its own merits. According to Crockett, the Secretary further stated that after the Otepka case is all over other persons in the State Department who are disloyal to the Secretary will be identified and ousted. Secretary Rusk, Crockett reported at the conference, declared "we will sweep the place clean."

Crockett stated channels to the Secretary were open, that if anyone should disagree with Department policy, he would be granted an audience with Secretary Rusk upon requesting it.

Crockett declared: "We have lost face and it's up to us to regain it."

Crockett further reported that there is "a second underground" in the Department, besides Otepka, which has furnished information to the Internal Security Subcommittee; and that the members of this "underground" will be identified and dealt with soon.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I was downtown on the last rolloca. If I had been present, I would have voted "yes."

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a copy of a bill.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing "A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people and for other purposes." It has been assigned the number H.R. 9520. I would like to request unanimous consent to extend my remarks regarding this bill and to have printed at the close of my remarks the text of the bill showing in italics the portions differing from certain other wilderness bills.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

For more than 7 years Americans have been making a special national effort to preserve as wilderness some of the remnants of the primeval that our ancestors found on this continent.

For more than 7 years the Congress has had legislation pending before it that would establish a national policy for

wilderness and a program to put such a policy into effect.

A large and an increasing number of citizens have become concerned. Magazines and newspapers across the country have urged support. And, President Kennedy placed wilderness legislation high in his conservation program.

As a matter of fact, when President Kennedy completed his conservation tour in October he said that he had come to three conclusions and the first was:

We must mount a new campaign to preserve a natural environment worthy of the wealthiest nation on earth.

Wilderness legislation is an instrument of foresight and protection. It is a modest, reasonable proposal to insure that the American people of this and future generations shall be able to enjoy the benefits of an enduring system of wilderness. It is an investment in the future of America, but it can be lost forever unless prompt action is taken.

SPONSORS INTRODUCE REVISIONS

The advocates and sponsors of the wilderness bill have through the years shown a great willingness to cooperate with all interested parties in order to achieve a sound and enduring wilderness preservation policy and a program that can be truly national.

Recently a number of House sponsors of earlier wilderness bills have demonstrated this by introducing revised measures designed to meet, as far as possible, the objections that have so far prevented action by the House. I am today joining this group.

NEW BILLS COMPARED

The revised bills introduced recently are similar in many respects, but a careful review indicates that there are significant differences; that there are in reality two different bills. One is the measure, H.R. 9070, introduced by our colleague from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. SAYLOR]. The other is the bill H.R. 9162, introduced by my good and very able friend from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and several other Members.

Both of these measures meet the constitutional objection that has been raised to earlier wilderness bills, including my own H.R. 991. Both of these new bills satisfies the right of Congress to act affirmatively in the designation of any wilderness area. But in several other respects, including provisions both lacking in one and contained in the other, I believe that H.R. 9070 provides a sounder base for consideration; for action; for expeditious treatment early in the next session of this Congress.

The bill that I am introducing today, therefore, H.R. 9520, is patterned after H.R. 9070, but includes several perfecting amendments.

OMISSIONS CORRECTED

There are several significant omissions in H.R. 9162 and others that are corrected in this bill.

IMPORTANT S. 4 SENTENCES RESTORED

First. Three omissions are the sentences that are in the Senate-passed act S. 4, as well as in my own and other